

MINUTES
UTAH DECEPTION DETECTION EXAMINER BOARD
February 15, 2001 - 9:00 A.M.
Room 428 - Fourth Floor - Heber Wells Bldg.
160 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, Utah

CONVENED: 9: 15 A.M.

ADJOURNED: 10:10 A.M.

PRESENT:

Clyde Ormond, Bureau Manager
Marty Simon, Board Secretary
Board Members:
Leroy Allen Mike Ferre
Scott Barnett

ABSENT:

David P.S.Mack Frank Wall
Elman Ellsworth

GUESTS:

None

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION:

DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:

Minutes

The minutes of the February 17, 2000 board meeting were approved as written.

APPOINTMENTS:

9:30 A.M.
Art Marshall

Mr. Marshall , a deception detection examiner intern, who was being supervised by Steve Bartlett, met with the Board. He stated he has been unable to contact Mr. Bartlett to review his exams. He further stated he has completed his two years of internship time and all of the exams required.

Mr. Scott Barnett agreed to review Mr. Marshall's exams for him to complete his internship. He stated he will try to contact Mr. Marshall or Mr. Marshall can contact him at 558-8410.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Status of Senate Bill 46

This Bill would exempt police officers for the requirement of licensure as a deception detection examiner. It also will allow them to administer the voice stress analysis tests as long as the police officer has the required voice stress analysis training that will be listed in

the proposed rules

Mr. Steve Bartlett, a deception detection examiner, had spoken against the bill during the legislative session, stating it was not a viable exam. However, the West Valley Chief of Police spoke in favor of the Bill. Mr. Ormond stated Mr. Bartlett should have stressed the public safety issue when he spoke to the legislature regarding this matter.

It was stated that a lot of states do not require licensure as a deception detection examiner. Mr. Ormond suggested that the Board might want to consider the possibility of de-regulation for this profession.

Proposed Rules Change

A copy of the proposed revision of the rules was given to each board member. The requirements for education to become certified for administering voice stress analysis only have been added. Mr. Ormond reviewed these requirements with the Board. He stated the Board would have to make the determination as to what courses would be acceptable to meet these education requirements.

Voice stress analysis measures the voice tremors in the voice. It can be done over the phone as well as in person. It is not even required for the person to be aware that it is being done. It seems as if this would violate a citizen's rights and would make the person doing it liable. The Board's opinion was that it should only be used in a police investigation as an investigative aid. It was noted that the federal government does not recognize voice stress as a viable exam due to a lack of accuracy.

If a person who is only trained in voice stress analysis administers a polygraph exam it would be considered unprofessional conduct since they would not have the required training. It was questioned whether it would be unprofessional conduct for a deception detection examiner to administer a voice stress analysis test if they had not been trained in this. The Board's opinion was that it should be.

Mr. Ormond asked the board members to take the copy of the proposed rules with them to review carefully. They should then submit any recommendations for revisions they deem necessary to him. A copy of the

rules will also be sent to Mr. Wall to review.

Detective Tippitt Letter

This letter, regarding the International Association that is located in Florida, was reviewed with the Board. It included a copy of the examination they administer for voice stress analysis. Mr. Ormond stated the Deception Detection Examiner Exam should either be revised to include questions about voice stress analysis or a separate exam should be developed.

Define Investigative Experience

The definition of “Investigative Experience” as defined in the rules was reviewed. The Board discussed the possibility of opening the wording up to include other types of investigative experience to meet the requirement for licensure. It was decided to just add “... as approved by the Division in collaboration with the Board” to the definition.

NEXT MEETING:

August 9, 2001

DATE APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON, UTAH DECEPTION
DETECTION EXAMINER BOARD

DATE APPROVED

BUREAU MANAGER, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL & PROFESSIONAL
LICENSING

DATE APPROVED

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF
OCCUPATIONAL & PROFESSIONAL
LICENSING

DATE APPROVED

DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL
& PROFESSIONAL LICENSING